	1				
1					
2	UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT				
3	SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK				
4	Case No. 05-44481				
5	x				
6	In the Matter of:				
7					
8	DELPHI CORPORATION, ET AL,				
9					
10	Debtor.				
11					
12	x				
13					
14	United States Bankruptcy Court				
15	One Bowling Green				
16	New York, New York				
17					
18	November 16, 2007				
19	10:09 AM				
20					
21	BEFORE:				
22	HON. ROBERT D. DRAIN				
23	U.S. BANKRUPTCY JUDGE				
24					
25					

2 1 2 APPEARANCES: 3 SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP 4 Attorneys for Delphi Corporation 5 333 West Wacker Drive 6 Chicago, IL 60606 7 8 BY: JOHN WM. BUTLER, JR., ESQ. 9 JOHN K. LYONS, ESQ. 10 RON E. MEISLER, ESQ. 11 ALBERT L. HOGAN, III, ESQ. 12 LISA B. DIAZ, ESQ. 13 14 15 SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP 16 Attorneys for Delphi Corporation 17 Four Times Square 18 New York, NY 10036 19 20 BY: KAYALYN A. MARAFIOTI 21 THOMAS J. MATZ 22 23 24 25

	. g = 5. 50				
	3				
1	FRIED, FRANK, HARRIS, SHRIVER & JACOBSON, LLP				
2	Attorneys for Official Committee of Equity Holders				
3	One New York Plaza				
4	New York, NY 10004				
5					
6	BY: BONNIE K. STEINGART, LLP				
7					
8	UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE				
9	OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES TRUSTEE				
10	33 Whitehall Street				
11	21st Floor				
12	New York, NY 10004				
13					
14	BY: ANDREW VELEZ-RIVERA, ESQ.				
15					
16					
17	KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART, PRESTON GATES ELLIS, LLP				
18	Attorneys for Wilmington Trust Company,				
19	Indentured Trustee				
20	599 Lexington Avenue				
21	New York, NY 10022				
22					
23	BY: EDWARD M. FOX, ESQ.				
24					
25					

	4				
1	WHITE & CASE LLP				
2	Attorneys for Appaloosa and Harbingers Plan Investors				
3	1155 Avenue of the Americas				
4	New York, NY 10036				
5					
6	BY: GERARD UZZI, ESQ.				
7					
8					
9	LATHAM & WATKINS LLP				
10	Attorneys for the Creditors' Committee				
11	885 Third Avenue				
12	Suite 1000				
13	New York, NY 10022				
14					
15	BY: MARK A. BROUDE, ESQ.				
16					
17					
18	SIMPSON THACHER & BARTLETT, LLP				
19	Attorneys for JP Morgan				
20	425 Lexington Avenue				
21	New York, NY 10017				
22					
23	BY: KENNETH S. ZIMAN, ESQ.				
24					
25					

5 1 GOODWIN PROCTOR LLP 2 Attorneys for Caspian Capital, 3 CastleRigg Master Investment, 4 Davidson Kempner Capital Management, 5 Elliott Associates, 6 Numeric Corporate Research and Asset Advisors, 7 Sailfish Capital Partners and White Box Advisors 8 599 Lexington Avenue 9 New York, NY 10022 10 11 BY: ALLAN S. BRILLIAN, ESQ. 12 13 KASOWITZ, BENSON, TORRES & FRIEDMAN, LLP 14 Attorneys for Trade Committee 15 1633 Broadway 16 New York, NY 10019 17 18 BY: ADAM L. SHIFF, ESQ. 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

	1 9 0 01 30	
		6
1	MAYER BROWN LLP	
2	Attorneys for Bank of America	
3	1675 Broadway	-
4	New York, NY 10019	
5		
6	BY: JEFFREY G. TOUGAS, ESQ.	
7		
8		
9	BROWN RUDNICK BERLACK ISRAELS	
10	Attorneys for Goldman Sachs	
11	7 Times Square	
12	New York, NY 10036	
13		
14	BY: GWENDOLEN D. LONG, ESQ.	
15		
16		
17	TOGUT, SEGAL & SEGAL LLP	
18	One Penn Plaza	
19	New York, NY 10119	
20		
21	BY: TALLY WIENER, ESQ.	
22		
23	ALSO PRESENT:	
24	ROBERT MOTHERSHEAD, Pro Se	
25	(TELEPHONICALLY)	

7 1 PROCEEDINGS 2 THE COURT: Please be seated. Okay. 3 Delphi Corporation. 4 MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, good morning. Jack Butler, 5 Kayalyn Marafioti and Al Hogan from the Skadden firm on behalf 6 of the debtors for the twenty-fourth omnibus hearing, the first 7 of two in November. 8 Your Honor, we have filed a proposed agenda. There 9 are five matters on it. With Your Honor's permission we would 10 take the adjourned and the presentment first and then move on 11 to the other matters. 12 THE COURT: Okay. 13 MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, matter number one on the 14 agenda is the Technology Properties 3018 motion at docket 15 number 10425. We've filed an objection at docket number 10650 16 and we've agreed with Technology properties, now, to move this 17 to the December 20th omnibus hearing. This will ultimately, 18 Your Honor, be dealt with, I believe, in the 3018 docket. 19

THE COURT: Okay.

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. BUTLER: Matter number five on the agenda, Your Honor, which is the presentment, is the application of the equity security holders for authorization of retention of Gregory P. Joseph Law Firms, LLC, as conflicts counsel at docket number 10906. Just one comment, Your Honor, from the debtors. Ms. Steingart did contact us as soon as the need for

8 1 this additional counsel arose and consulted with the debtors. 2 The debtors have no objection to the relief requested. 3 THE COURT: Okay. 4 MS. STEINGART: Good morning, Your Honor. 5 Bonnie Steingart from Fried Frank on behalf of the Official 6 Committee of Equity Holders. We filed this emergency motion 7 just several days ago when the issue of a conflict first arose. 8 I don't think that we need to go into great detail about it 9 unless the Court would like us to. 10 THE COURT: No, I've read it. You're seeking interim 11 retention at this point? 12 MS. STEINGART: Yes, because Ms. Leonhard --13 THE COURT: Interim approval of the retention? 14 MS. STEINGART: Right. Because Ms. Leonhard's away 15 and we thought that we would put it on for final on the 29th so 16 that she would have an opportunity to look at all the papers. 17 THE COURT: Okay. Obviously the counsel is getting 18 to work right away. So it makes sense to seek the relief now. 19 MS. STEINGART: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Any -- any other comments or statements? 21 MR. VELEZ RIVERA: Andrew Velez-Rivera for the 22 United States Trustee. Mr. Steingart got it all, Your Honor. 23 Thank you. 24 THE COURT: Okay. So I will enter that order today. 25 MS. STEINGART: All right. I have a black line that

9 1 has some adjustments that Mr. Leonhard has made. If I might 2 hand up both the clean and the black line. 3 THE COURT: Okay. That's fine. 4 MS. STEINGART: Thank you. 5 MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, the next matter on the 6 agenda, matter number two, is the DIP extension motion at docket number 10787. This matter is uncontested. There is a 7 8 record, Your Honor, we'd like to make, regarding the extension 9 we have made available. There are seventeen exhibits we'd like 10 moved into evidence. Briefly, to summarize them Your Honor, 11 Exhibit 1 is the declaration of John D. Sheehan, our chief 12 restructuring officer. Exhibits 2 through 8 are the credit 13 agreement documents. Exhibit 9 through 16 are the various 14 court documents applicable to this matter and Exhibit 17 is the 15 affidavit of service. 16 Your Honor, we'd like to move Exhibit 1 through 17 17 in --18 THE COURT: When you say the credit documents, 19 they're as revised as detailed in the -- in the supplement? 20 MR. BUTLER: That's correct, Your Honor. 21 THE COURT: Okay. 22 MR. BUTLER: And I would note that that Exhibits 5 23 through 7 have been marked highly confidential. 24 THE COURT: Okay. 25 MR. BUTLER: And they're for professional eyes only.

10 1 THE COURT: Fine. 2 MR. BUTLER: The others -- the others are in the 3 public record and I'd like to move admission of Exhibits 1 4 through 17 into evidence. THE COURT: All right. Does anyone have any 6 objection to that? All right. They're admitted. 7 (Declaration of John D. Sheehan was hereby received as Debtor's 8 Exhibit 1 for identification, as of this date.) 9 (Credit Agreement Documents was hereby received as Debtor's 10 Exhibit 2-8 for identification, as of this date.) 11 (Court Documents was hereby received as Debtor's Exhibit 9-16 12 for identification, as of this date.) 13 (Affidavit of Service was hereby received as Debtor's Exhibit 14 17 for identification, as of this date.) 15 MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I'd also like to present 16 Mr. Sheehan, he is present in the courtroom today, for any 17 cross examination with respect to his testimony. 18 THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone want to cross examine 19 Mr. Sheehan on his declaration? Okay. Fine. 20 MR. BUTLER: All right. Your Honor, from the 21 debtor's perspective we would rely on the record, I think the 22 question -- the need for extended DIP financing here, I think, 23 is not questioned by any party in the case and we believe the

presented to Your Honor is appropriate.

form of proposed order, as it's been amended and black line

24

25

THE COURT: Okay. I've reviewed the supplement, including his description of the relatively minor changes to the proposed extension of financing. I note that you've clarified further the treatment of the PBGC and I just want to make sure I'm clear on this; in a couple of places you've added the word "replacement." So PBGC's replacement liens, as I understand it, that goes both ways, particularly given the reference to the DASHI inter-company transfer order: PBGC only has a lien to the extent it -- it only has a replacement lien to the extent that it had a lien to begin with.

MR. BUTLER: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So this isn't conferring any additional lien on the PBGC?

MR. BUTLER: That's correct, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Anyone have any comments on this motion? All right. I will grant it as modified by the supplement.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, the next matter on the agenda is matter number three, this is the Saginaw Chasse Asset Sale Motion at docket number 9368. There were two objections -- three objections, actually, filed to this matter. The first was the UAW's limited objection at docket number 9584, you may remember from earlier hearings that matter has been resolved consensually. Then there were objections that were filed by Joe J. Debtor, T-E-D-D-O-R --

THE COURT: Looking for a new client?

MR. BUTLER: -- at docket number 9644 and also by U.S. Aeroteam Inc. at docket number 10652. Both of those objections have now been withdrawn on the docket and the matter, therefore, goes -- proceeds this morning on an uncontested basis.

There are just a couple of items, Your Honor, that I would like to bring to the Court's attention. First, I'd like to make the evidentiary record regarding the sale of the Chasse business. There are, in connection with this transaction, fifteen documents to be entered into evidence. They include, at Exhibit 1, the declaration of Mr. Sheehan in support of this. Exhibit 2 and 3 include the agreement -- including the third amendment to the agreement. Exhibits 4 through 12 are the Court documents associated with this transaction. Exhibits 13 and 14 are the UAW agreements and Exhibit 15 is the Affidavit of Service.

Your Honor, I'd like to move Exhibits 1 through 15 into the evidentiary record.

THE COURT: Okay. Are there any objections to that?

All right, they're admitted.

(Declaration of Mr. Sheehan was hereby received as Chasse

Business's Exhibit 1 for identification, as of this date.)

(Agreement was hereby received as Chasse Business's Exhibit 2 & 3 for identification, as of this date.)

13 1 (Court Documents for Chasse was hereby received as 2 Chasse Business's Exhibit 4-12 for identification, as of this 3 date.) 4 (UAW Agreements was hereby received as Chasse Business's 5 Exhibit 13 & 14 for identification, as of this date.) 6 (Affidavit of Service was hereby received as Chasse Business's 7 Exhibit 15 for identification, as of this date.) 8 MR. BUTLER: And similarly, Your Honor, I'd like to 9 present Mr. Sheehan for any cross examination the parties may 10 have with respect to his declaration. 11 THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone want to cross examine 12 Mr. Sheehan on his declaration? Very well. One point -- I 13 just want -- I believe I know the answer to this but as set 14 forth in the supplement, the Canadian assets are being treated 15 slightly differently. The purchase price for those assets, 16 though, hasn't changed has it? 17 MR. BUTLER: No, Your Honor. What's happening now 18 is, as a technical matter, the -- the purchase agreement that 19 was associated with the Canadian assets terminated. And the 20 way that transaction's now been resolved is the overall, what 21 I'll call the master agreement, has been increased by -- by the 22 1. -- I think its 1.2 million, if I recall. 23 THE COURT: Right. 24 MR. BUTLER: And DASS is acquiring those assets from

the -- on an inter-company basis from the Canadian entity.

25

THE COURT: Economically, it's basically the same thing.

MR. BUTLER: It's -- if everything goes as we're planning, Your Honor, it should be a wash.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I would point out that this particular transaction for the Saginaw Chasse divestiture, the purchaser is TRW Integrated Chasse Systems LLC. The purchase price is approximately 42.6 million dollars. There is a purchase protection here, in terms of a breakup fee, of 1.5 million dollars. And there is the potential for expense reimbursement as well.

I should also point out, Your Honor, that DASS LLC is entitled to expense reimbursement from TRW because on the Canadian assets we've agreed to move them to Saginaw and they've -- and TRW's agreed to pay up to 400,000 dollars for the cost of moving those items from Mexico to Saginaw and then another 500 -- it's actually -- the Canadian one is 517,000 to move the assets from Canada to Saginaw. So there's some additional expense reimbursement running to the debtors favor in connection with this transaction as well.

The only item -- other item, I think, I'd like to point out to Your Honor, I think Your Honor is aware that this had been -- this matter had been carried so that General Motors and the purchaser could reach their agreements, that's occurred

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

now. And as is always the case, it took some time for the supply agreement and all the UAW matters to be put in order. Now that it's put in order everybody wants this transaction completed promptly. And in order to do that, what we propose to do is to change the two-step sale process slightly by still going out and giving notice -- sale notice within one business day of the entry of this order, if Your Honor enters it, and publication notice within three days or as soon as practical after that. But our proposal would be, Your Honor, if we don't receive any alternative bids by 11 AM prevailing eastern time on November 27th to bring this to the Court for the sale approval at the November 29th omnibus hearing. If, in fact, there is -- there are qualified bids that are received by the bid deadline, then we would conduct an auction of the assets at 10 AM prevailing eastern time on or about December 6, 2007, using minimum bid increments of 250,000 dollars. And then we would come to the December -- I believe it's 20th, omnibus hearing for the sale hearing at that time. So it's a bit different then we have used in the past but it is still a twostep process.

Today, we're asking you simply to approve the bid procedures and the bid protections that are in place and to determine the -- the sale -- the approval of the sale on either the 29th of November or December 20th, depending upon whether there's going to be an auction.

THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone want to address this motion? All right. I obviously reviewed it, as well as the supplement, and in particular reviewed the changes to the bidding procedures, as far as the timing is concerned. Given that this motion was filed a long time ago and that any competitive bidder has certainly been on notice since then, if not well before then, I'm comfortable with the changes on the timing. So, I'll approve it as modified.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, the next matter, and the last matter on the agenda, is the company's exit financing motion at docket number 10854. This matter is contested. There have been timely objections filed by the ad hoc bondholder group at docket number 10903 by Wilmington Trust Company at docket number 10905 and by the Committee of Unsecured Creditors at docket number 10930 and later -- that was redacted later after an announcement from a company they filed their unredacted objection with which we had no objection at docket number 10933, in terms of the filing of the unredacted objection.

There have been, Your Honor, two joinders filed overnight that we don't think are particularly timely. In fact, we don't think they are timely under the case management order but we're not going to press the timeliness issue at this hearing.

Your Honor, with respect to first the evidentiary

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

17

record, what I'd like to do is describe the exhibits that are being considered for this hearing, there are twenty-one of The first is the -- Mr. Sheehan's declaration at Exhibit 21. The exit financing documents are Exhibits 2-7. I would point out that Exhibits 2-6 are highly confidential. The -- there are presentations that were made with respect to these matters to the joint statutory committees and to the board of directors, those are Exhibit 8 and 10. As we -they're both -- they're all three marked highly confidential. And as Mr. Brody and I have talked about in the past, these are being offered not for the truth of the matters asserted there but in fact that these are the presentations made to those -- to the stakeholders and the board of directors at those dates and times. Exhibit 11 is a news release issued by the company on November 14th. Exhibit 12 through 19 are the related court documents. Exhibit 20 is the summary objection chart and Exhibit 21 is the affidavit of service. Your Honor, I'd like to move the admissions of Exhibit 1 through 21 into evidence. THE COURT: Okay. Are there any objections to those admissions for the purposes for which they're being admitted? MR. FOX: Your Honor, Edward Fox from Kirkpatrick and Lockhart on behalf of Wilmington Trust Company as indenture

trustee. With respect to Mr. Sheehan's declaration the ultimate sentence in paragraph 15 is hearsay and we would like that not admitted, certainly not of the truth of the matter asserted.

THE COURT: Well, when you say "the debtors," Mr. Sheehan, do you mean yourself? Have you yourself been advised of this?

MR. BUTLER: Which sentence -- can we read the sentence into the record, just so --

THE COURT: The sentence says, "The debtors have been advised that they should seek to commence syndication efforts as early as practicable." And my question to Mr. Sheehan is, is that something you've been told or is that something you know from your own personal knowledge?

MR. SHEEHAN: It was something I was told, Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right.

MR. SHEEHAN: I'm sorry, can I just clarify that a little bit more.

THE COURT: Well, were you told it by the person who was making the advice or were you told that someone made the advice to someone else?

MR. SHEEHAN: What I would say to you, Your Honor, is that through my experience as the chief restructuring officer of Delphi, and with knowledge of what's happening in the

capital markets right at the moment, I believe that sentence to be my own personal opinion. It has also been the statements that have been made to me by the banks that we're working with, with respect to the exit financing. That is the basis for that sentence.

THE COURT: All right. I -- I will admit that sentence to the extent that he's been told that by the banks that are working on it but not that it's necessarily true.

MR. FOX: That's fine, Your Honor. So long as it's not admitted for the truth of the matter asserted.

THE COURT: Right. Okay. All right. So those exhibits will be admitted on that basis.

(Declaration of Mr. Sheehan was hereby received as Financing

(Financing Documents was hereby received as Financing Motion's

Motion's Exhibit 21 for identification, as of this date.)

Exhibit 2-7 for identification, as of this date.)

17 (Presentations was hereby received as Financing Motion's

Exhibit 8-10 for identification, as of this date.)

19 (Related Court Documents was hereby received as Financing

Motion's Exhibit 12-19 for identification, as of this date.)

21 (Summary Objection Chart was hereby received as Financing

Motion's Exhibit 20 for identification, as of this date.)

MR. BUTLER: Your Honor, I -- thank you very much.

24 I'd then like to present Mr. Sheehan for any cross examination

25 by the parties.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

Pg 20 of 38 20 1 THE COURT: I'd like to put that off for a minute. 2 MR. BUTLER: Okay. 3 THE COURT: Since it seems to me that the basis for 4 the committee's objection and the chime-ins by the other 5 unsecured creditor groups really goes to a specific issue, 6 which is the direction of this case. And on that point I'd 7 first like to know which of the investors has decided that it's 8 still in this case and which has decided it's out? There was a 9 singularly unresponsive public disclosure filed in the 13(d) 10 statement that one was out. Is it still out and which one was 11 it? 12 MR. UZZI: Your Honor, Gerard Uzzi for -- from 13 White and Case on behalf of Appaloosa and Harbingers, Plan 14 Investors. Your Honor, just so that the record's clear, there 15 was a prior attempt, about two weeks ago, to amend the EPCA. 16 THE COURT: We'll get to that. 17 MR. UZZI: Pardon me? 18 THE COURT: We'll get to that, but continue. 19 MR. UZZI: In that attempt, all of the plan investors 20 other than Goldman Sachs, signed commitments. 21 THE COURT: So Goldman Sachs was the unidentified 22 investor?

MR. UZZI: Goldman Sachs was the unidentified

investor, Your Honor.

23

24

25

THE COURT: Did they give a reason? Did they run out

of money?

MR. UZZI: Well, Your Honor, I don't -- I don't represent Goldman Sachs.

THE COURT: Is anyone here who represents Goldman

Sachs? I suspected as much. They will not be able to slink

away in this case. If they think they can avoid the

reputational and legal issues they are sadly mistaken. You can

continue.

MR. UZZI: With respect to the amendments that were filed two days ago, Your Honor, all of the plan investors have signed commitments with respect to those.

THE COURT: They've come back on board?

MR. UZZI: Goldman Sachs, along with all the other plan investors, have signed commitments.

THE COURT: Deciding that more than doubling the discount that had previously been negotiated and approved in August of this year was sufficient for their purposes?

MR. UZZI: Well, again Your Honor, I do not represent Goldman Sachs.

THE COURT: I understand. And they're not here because they thought that they could do this all in secret.

All right. You could tell that I believe that there have been extremely improvident developments in this case. And I will summarize them, as far as I'm concerned, briefly. But because the debtor's response indicates that those developments are not

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

22

final, I'm going to speak to the parties in private about the next week or so.

You may recall that there was competition for the plan investment opportunity. And I ruled, both times, including in August of this year -- and as we can all read Mr. Sheehan's affidavit, at that time the turmoil in the credit markets was known, that's paragraph 9 of his affidavit -- and I ruled in favor of this investor group not just because they were the highest bid, because they weren't, but because they were the best bid, because they had done their due diligence, because they were represented to me, and I believed it, that two of the nation's biggest investment banks, including Goldman Sachs, and large hedge funds that had also their own reputational interests, would stick by this debtor and their fundamental economic commitments, unlike the competitive -- the competitor investor who had not done due diligence originally, when this was first negotiated, and had futzed around about the due diligence thereafter.

I also approved the August amendment to the EPGA because it curtailed the number of "outs" that the investors had. And in particular, it curtailed the financing out and the market condition out in the material adverse effect provision.

I am very distressed, at least based upon what I have seen as the basis for the changes to the EPCA, which is financing conditions that were well known to the parties in August and

which they said would not constitute a material adverse effect being asserted, as well as a minor change, generally, as to GM's requirements in the business, which, frankly, also appears to me to have been excluded from the material adverse effect provision of the agreement.

Now, you may say that the plan has changed because you can't provide as much cash to cash-out creditors. I have a hard time seeing how that affects the equity investors, particularly given GMs responsible agreements here to take less cash, as a customer and as part of its settlement.

The premise of the negotiations that this company has been undertaking over the past several months, and upon which thousands of workers have made enormous personal sacrifices was the framework of these agreements. And I am very distressed that they have changed, sucking out hundreds of millions of dollars over these apparent excuses. I appreciate that this is a big case and a big operating business. It's sort of like an ocean liner, and it's hard to change an ocean liner in midstream. But what I have seen suggests to me that maybe, if the parties don't come to their senses and appreciate that as a sponsor of this company they have to stand by the company -- because otherwise why have a sponsor, why not give the equity to those who are in the debt already and in the equity already -- that we're going to change course. And that's what I want to talk to you about now.

I want to see the two official committees, the debtor, whatever plan sponsors deign to be here today and the other two objectors.

MR. UZZI: Your Honor, may GM attend?

THE COURT: Oh, yes. This way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

(Recess from 10:32 till 11:31 AM)

THE COURT: Okay. We're back on the record in Delphi.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. Your Honor, continuing with matter number 4 on the record, the exit financing motion. Your Honor, the company would like to proceed with the motion. We've obviously received guidance from chambers and understand the concerns expressed by the Court both on the record and in chambers regarding the potential EPCA amendment, which is on the hearing for November 29th, as I think we had -- the company had stated in their filings, the company is committed to continue to negotiate with our statutory committees between now and the 29th regarding both the disclosure statement and the plan amendments and related documents and we will continue to do that. Under Your Honor's prior order, entered in the Court, the company has until the afternoon of November 28th to file changed pages with respect to those matters. And I think we've been pretty clear, both in our public announcements and our filing with respect to this hearing, about the company's

commitment to continue to try to bring consensus to this transaction if we can.

The company, also, is certainly guided by the concerns expressed about parties in the case negotiating around the edges for their particular pecuniary interest and the company recognizes that for this company to go forward and emerge from Chapter 11 in the short term, which is what we think is absolutely required now that we, from a company perspective have completed all that needs to be done in Chapter 11 and need now to emerge, that we need to get on with the business of financing the case and emerging and we need, obviously, the support of our stakeholders in that regard.

Having said that, the company, and Mr. Sheehan's -- I think where we were in this hearing was with Mr. Sheehan's declaration offering Mr. Sheehan for cross examination in his declaration; it's clear, Your Honor, and the company believes that given the capital markets and given the need to raise exit financing on a best efforts basis, and given the fact that we don't believe that the objectors have any particular issue with the structure of the exit financing, putting aside the EPCA and emergence financing, the exit financing. The process we've used to select the proposed agent, the cost associated with them moving forward on this, the ultimate purposes of this and I would point out Your Honor, both that the acknowledgement letter signed by the lead arrangers, as well as the underlying

agreements that Your Honor's aware of, provide that the lead arrangers have the opportunity to consider and approve any equity plan that's brought to them by the company and recognize that no equity plan has yet been approved by the Court in terms of the November 29th hearing. They understand that and we understand it.

But the company does believe that it's in the best interest of stakeholders and the company to proceed along these lines. And therefore, Your Honor, we would present Mr. Sheehan, with the Court's permission -- we'd present Mr. Sheehan for cross examination by the parties.

THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone want to cross examine
Mr. Sheehan? All right. Well, Mr. Sheehan, if anything was
accomplished by the last hour, at least one thing is clear, you
don't have to testify.

MR. BUTLER: And Your Honor, I think, from the company's perspective with the record in place, the matter is now admitted into evidence and the record in place, we think the company has demonstrated, under section 363 of the Bankruptcy Code that we've exercised reasonable business judgment that ought to be confirmed by this Court for purposes of moving forward with the exit financing on the terms and conditions set forth in the exhibits that have now been admitted into evidence. And of course, subject to the guidance we received from chambers and have discussed with the

objectors, in moving forward to implement those arrangements. Our hope is that we will be in a position, moving forward, to be able to obtain the commitments and move to the -- a confirmed syndication subsequent to the November 29th hearing in the December timeframe. That's our goal. We believe we have the support of our lead arrangers for moving along that timeline. And we would appreciate Your Honor's consideration of this motion.

THE COURT: Okay. Does anyone have anything further to say on this matter?

MR. BROUDE: Good morning, Your Honor, Mark Broude,
Latham & Watkins on behalf of the creditors' committee. Quite
simply, Your Honor, and I'll be very brief. We still think
this should be adjourned to November 29th. Signing up this
agreement adds yet another party whose consent is required if
we're going to change the plan of reorganization. We share the
debtor's hope that we'll be able to negotiate a fully
consensual resolution between now and the 29th. But if we do
so, the plan is going to change. And locking in lead
arrangers, now, to a particular plan that may or may not be
what ultimately comes before Your Honor on the 29th is not
necessarily productive.

What do we get by that, three business days. If work is going to start right after Thanksgiving, it can start on Friday rather than on Monday. There's not a lot of loss of

time there. Whereas, you're locking in another party whose consent we're going to have to get if the plan changes. We just don't see that there's a benefit to be gained whereas we don't -- whereas if we just push it off to the 29th we can have the lead arrangers on board with a plan that we hope will have everyone's support.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. BRILLIANT: Good morning, Your Honor, Allan Brilliant on behalf of Caspian Capital, CastleRigg Master Investment,
Davidson Kempner Capital Management, Elliott Associates,
Numeric Corporate Research and Asset Advisors,
Sailfish Capital Partners and White Box Advisors. Your Honor,
we have also filed an objection and enjoinder in the Official
Creditors' Committee's objection to this motion.

We also believe that it's premature for this to be approved at this point. As we say in our papers, we believe the debtors are putting, you know, the cart before the horse. They're going out to seek to get financing for a plan that doesn't have the support of four of the creditor constituencies and at this point in time is not confirmable. We're very concerned that it will create confusion in the marketplace if - when this plan, you know, will change. And undoubtedly, you know, will change again. The cash needs of the debtors are modified or the equity investments are significantly changed.

We also don't see the benefit of having this go out -- be

approved today given the holiday next week and the fact that there's going to be a hearing on the 29th when things are going to be much more definitive.

As Your Honor knows this plan has changed, you know, three times in the last six or eight weeks. Our expectation is it's going to change again. The debtor's own papers, in their argument today, is that they're going to be having discussions with parties and would hope to resolve these things. So even they acknowledge it's going to change again in the future. And consequently, we just think that it's premature at this point.

And then under section 363 standards, although it is a business judgment rule, it would be an abuse of discretion of the board to seek to get financing for a plan that doesn't have the support for any significant creditor body.

THE COURT: But as I under -- as I read the engagement letter, it's not financing for a particular plan. And I'll make it perfectly clear in my ruling that that's the case. And I think there's also no doubt that all the parties in interest believe that there are serious adverse consequences to them if the debtor does not emerge in the timeframe they're seeking to emerge in, and exit financing is necessary for that, whether or not the particular plan on the table is -- is that plan. So,

be starting to work today, if I approve this motion, understand

I -- I think as long as I'm comfortable that those who would

that they're raising money based on the fundamentals of the company and not necessarily a particular investment in the company by the plan sponsors, as recently outlined in the press release, then I'm -- I'm reasonably comfortable that what they're doing is in the best interest of the debtor.

MR. BRILLIANT: Your Honor, I understand your point. Unfortunately the agreement with the proposed lead arrangers would provide, as Mr. Broude, you know, has said that they would have to approve any changes. So they would be asked to go out and seek financing, again, that they would have the right to veto if they didn't like the way the plan was modified.

THE COURT: Well, it's being considered and ultimately would be approved by me, today, on a pretty clear premise, which is that, as I see it, that approval right is something they should be able to assert if the change in the plan jeopardizes their financing. Frankly, that's how I viewed the EPCA when I approved it in August. That the economics of that EPCA, the value of it, was what was to be preserved in the condition saying that the plan will be approved "consistent with" the EPCA. So I would not want to be in the shoes of a --well, of these lead arrangers if they came back to me and said we're vetoing this plan for some reason other than it jeopardizes their financing.

MR. BRILLIANT: All right. I have nothing further,

Your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. FOX: Your Honor, Edward Fox from Kirkpatrick and Lockhart on behalf of Wilmington Trust Company as Indenture Trustee, I would just join in Mr. Broude's comments with respect to the committee. I certain appreciate what you just said and that's, I think, very helpful to us. The documents are not structured in that fashion, as it stands, in what, you know, was initially in the motion for the Court to approve. So that certainly would be very helpful if that's changed. Because one of the concerns I have is that we wind up with another club being put in the hand of somebody to beat the creditors with if they don't want to go along with what's being put on the table.

THE COURT: Well, these people -- these arrangers are JP Morgan and CitiCorp, in their capacity as lenders, exit lenders. They're not going to be able to beat on the creditors because they may hold debt in the company and want some sort of, you know, advantage out of that. As anyone who enters into a contract with a debtor in possession, they have to deal in good faith, and I'm confident they will. And that's how I view this motion. At the same time, I don't view the debtor or the creditors as having some sort of leverage over them. You know, all they have to do is do their job and raise the financing. I think we all know the type of plan that would jeopardize that

financing.

MR. ZIMAN: Your Honor, Ken Ziman from
Simpson, Thacher and Bartlett on behalf of JP Morgan in its
capacity as a proposed lead arranger here. I appreciate Your
Honor's comments, I understand. I'll communicate that back to
my client. I obviously haven't spoken to them. I don't think
what Your Honor is contemplating is a problem. I just would
note the one comment I would make on the record is that
obviously we care who we lend to, at some level. So if there's
a radical change to the identity of the sponsorship here, that
will be something we'd have to take into account.

THE COURT: I understand. And I think people should take away from my remarks this morning that the identity of the sponsor is very important and how they live up to their responsibilities is very important. And sometimes a sponsor's reputation, unfortunately, may change during the course of a deal.

MR. ZIMAN: Thank you, Your Honor.

THE COURT: And then they can also clean it up during the course of a deal.

MR. SHIFF: Your Honor, if I may, Adam Shiff of
Kasowitz, Benson, Torres and Friedman on behalf of the Trade
Committee. And I don't want to belabor the record. I know
it's late here. We concur with the remarks made by those on
this side and would also request that the Court adjourn it to

November 29. However, we don't want to belabor the record by repeating what's already been said. I just want it to be clear, thank you.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Based upon the record of this hearing, I won't adjourn this motion but will, rather, approve it. It is clear to me, as a result of this hearing, that the only objection to the financing, and it's a legitimate objection until clarified, is that the financing would be too tied to the present proposal for an investment, by the plan sponsors, in the debtor.

However, it's been clarified on the record that that is not the case. And it's my view that while, ultimately, the financing will depend upon the terms of a plan, certainly for the next several days, if not for longer, the lead lenders' efforts will be based upon the fundamental economic condition of the debtor. And on that basis, recognizing that there's been no objection to the limited amount of fees or relatively limited amount of fees that would be incurred based on my approval today - and, more importantly, no objection to the fundamental proposition that the debtors, as they have been saying throughout the last several months, are correct in urging that this process continue to move forward promptly -- I believe that it's in the best interest of the debtors to take this next step now. So I'll approve the financing. And I've reviewed the order and the order is consistent with the record

and I have no changes in it. Not "the financing" -- I approve the entry into the agreement with the lead lenders.

MR. BUTLER: Thank you very much, Your Honor. Your Honor, that's the last matter on today's omnibus agenda. There is a claims hearing that we filed that will be starting this afternoon --

THE COURT: It's at 1.

MR. BUTLER: -- at 1 o'clock.

THE COURT: Right. Let me say, and this somewhat reiterates what I said in private, I think the parties, as they have in this case generally, need to work very hard over the next two weeks. To that end, my view is that if you have a choice between a deposition and a meeting, you should have the meeting and that you should focus on the issues that I've identified as to the direction of the plan.

Mr. Butler was correct that I'm of the view that no party in this case should use the need of the debtors, and all of the debtors' constituents, to emerge promptly from Chapter 11 now that the debtors have done all of the things that they have done to stabilize their business. And that includes the agreements with the unions and with GM. Having set that fundamental basis for their business valuation, and knowing that this is probably one of the most due diligenced companies on the planet, I would hope that with that direction the parties will negotiate, based on value, and not based on some

perceived leverage that they have deriving from the debtors' desire to emerge from Chapter 11 promptly. If they don't do that, then I will turn to parties who do take that approach. That is an approach based on fundamental values and not shortterm leverage. Okay. So I'll see whoever's waiting at 1. MR. BUTLER: Thank you, Your Honor. (Proceedings Concluded at 11:49)

r	Pg 36 of 38			
			36	
1				
2				
3				
4		INDEX		
5				
6		EXHIBITS		
7	DEBTOR'S	DESCRIPTION	PAGE	
8	1	Declaration of	10	
9		John D. Sheehan		
10	2-8	Credit Agreement	10	
11	Documents			
12	9-16	Court Documents 10		
13	17	Affidavit of	10	
14	Service			
15	1	Declaration of Mr.	12	
16	Sheehan			
17	2 & 3	Agreement	12	
18	4-12 Court Documents 13		13	
19	for Chasse			
20	13 & 14	UAW Agreements	13	
21	15	Affidavit of	13	
22		Service		
23	21	Declaration of Mr.	19	
24		Sheehan		
25	2-7	Financing	19	

i	Pg 37 of 38					
						37
1		Docume	ents			
2	8-10	Preser	ntations		19	
3		EXE	ніві	TS (Co	ont.)	
4						
5	DEBTOR'S	DESCR	IPTION		PAGE	
6	12-19	Relate	ed Court		19	
7		Docume	ents			
8	20 Summary Objection 19					
9		Chart				
10						
11	RULINGS					
12			Page	Line		
13	Order Seeking Inter:	im	8	17		
14	Retention Granted					
15	Extension of DIP as		11	16		
16	Modified By Suppleme	ent				
17	Granted					
18	Approval of Bidding	and	16	1		
19	Sale Procedures as I	Modifie	ed			
20	Approval of Entry in	nto	33	24		
21	Sale Procedures with Lead					
22	Lenders					
23						
24						
25						

		38	
1			
2			
3			
4	CERTIFICATION		
5			
6	I, Pnina Eilberg, court approved transcriber, certify that the		
7	foregoing is a correct transcript from the official electronic		
8	sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled		
9	matter.		
10			
11		November 19, 2007	
12	Signature of Transcriber	Date	
13			
14	Pnina Eilberg		
15	typed or printed name		
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			